

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on December 16, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully noted. From the Summary page, claims 1-18 were pending. Claims 1-7 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 8-11, 13, 15, 16 and 18 are rejected. In addition, an objection was made to claims 12, 14 and 17 for reciting allowable subject matter. An objection also was made to the Specification. The Drawings filed May 13, 2005 have been accepted. Further, the Information Disclosure Statements filed May 13, 2005 and June 26, 2008 have been considered.

From the Detailed Action, acknowledgment has been made of Applicant's Claim for Priority to JP 2002-363656 filed December 16, 2002.

By this response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 14 and canceled claims 11 and 12. In particular, the features of presently canceled claims 11 and 12 have been incorporated into claim 8. No statutory new matter has been added. All claim amendments are supported by the originally filed disclosure.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant urges that claims 8-10 and 13-18 now stand in condition for allowance.

Specification Objection

An objection was made to the Abstract of the Disclosure. By this response, the Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended, *supra*. Thus, Applicant kindly requests withdrawal and reconsideration of the objection to the Abstract.

Claim Objections

An objection was made to claims 11 and 12 for purportedly lacking antecedent basis. The Office Action recommends that the recitation of "*shell part*" and "*core part*" be replaced with -- first or second shell part -- and -- first and second core part -- as appropriate. As an initial matter the objection to claims 11 and 12 is moot due to claim cancellation. However, the objection is traversed because the subject matter of canceled claims 11 and 12 have been wholly incorporated into claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed subject matter of canceled claims 11 and 12, as currently incorporated into claim 1, does not lack antecedent basis. To ensure full

appreciation of the claimed subject matter, particular reference is drawn to Figure 11 (2nd embodiment) and paras. 58-61 of the Publication 2006/0015078. To one of ordinary skill, the relevant section of the Specification suggests that first and second shells recite proper antecedent basis. That is, FIG. 11 discloses a first plate 11 having a first shell 41 and a core part 42, whereas a second plate 12 only has a second shell 43. As such, the Examiner's suggestion to recite first or second core parts is incorrect because the core part is only referenced with respect to the first plate. In view of the foregoing, Applicant courteously request that the claimed subject matter of canceled claims 11 and 12 which has been incorporated into claim 1 is proper.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 8-11, 13, 15, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Blake et al. (US 4,429,693). The rejection as to claim 11 is moot due to claim cancellation. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action's reference to claim 15, herein, is improper because claim 15 has only been expressly rejected as being obvious over Blake, as listed below, *infra*. Thus, the rejection as to claims 8-10, 13, 16 and 18 is traversed herein.

Applicant respectfully submits that the allowable subject matter of claim 12 and claim 11 have been incorporated into amended claim 8. Therefore, claim 8, as amended, patentably distinguishes thereover. As such, Applicant courteously requests withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection as to amended claim 8 and claims 9, 10, 13, 16 and 18, dependent thereon, and that such claims be placed in immediate condition for allowance.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § (a) as being unpatentable over Blake. The rejection as to claim 15 is traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 depends upon amended claim 8. Since amended claim 8 recites allowable subject matter, claim 15 is also patentably distinguishable over Blake. Thus, Applicant courteously requests withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection and that claim 15 be placed in immediate condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for all allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 033036.089.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: TB Patel
Tayan B. Patel, Reg. No. 58,402
for Robert G. Weilacher, Reg. No. 20,531
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 3100, Promenade II
Atlanta, GA 30309-3592
TEL: (404) 815-3593
FAX: (404) 685-6893

Dated: March 10, 2009